

**IN THE CLAIMS**

Please amend claim 5 as follows:

---

*A |* 5. (Amended) The mount of claim [3] 4, wherein said case has an interior side and an exterior side, and wherein said processor is visible from said exterior side.

---

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-18 remain in this application. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein.

Claim 5 is objected to under 35 U.S.C. 112 as lacking antecedent basis for the limitation "case." Claim 5 has been amended in view of the remarks made in the Office Action.

Claims 16 and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,530,620 (Sangveraphunsiri). Claims 1-5 and 8-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sangveraphunsiri in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,603,618 (Hayakawa). Claims 6 and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sangveraphunsiri in view of Hayakawa and U.S. Patent No. 5,748,446 (Feightner). Finally, claims 12-15 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sangveraphunsiri in view of Hayakawa and U.S. Patent No. 5,576,935 (Freer).

Each of rejected claims, either directly or indirectly, includes the feature of having a

connector that mounts a processor to a motherboard wherein the processor is “horizontal” or “parallel” to the motherboard. The prior art fails to disclose at least this feature, and therefore Applicant respectfully requests that the above rejections be reconsidered and removed.

For example, claim 1 recites the limitation of “a motherboard connector to be mounted on a motherboard to receive said edge connector with said processor in an orientation parallel to said motherboard.” As stated in the Specification, this configuration offers several advantages, such as reducing the number of components necessary to attach a processor to a motherboard, offering the capability of removing the processor from the motherboard without removing the outside casing of the computer, allowing a user to readily identify the type of processor used by the computer, and so forth. (Specification, Page 6, Lines 1-12).

Sangveraphunsiri purportedly describes a system for upgrading a computer by adding a plug-in module having higher performing chip sets. (Sangveraphunsiri, Col. 2, Lines 55-63). As correctly pointed out by the Examiner, Sangveraphunsiri fails to disclose “the motherboard being connected to the edge connector in a parallel orientation as claimed.” (Office Action, Page 3). This missing limitation, according to the Office Action, is found in Hayakawa. More particularly, the Office Action states that “Hayakawa et al. teaches a mounting board unit having a motherboard (1-1) with a connector (1-2) being connected in a parallel orientation to the edge connector (2-3) of a processor board (2-1) . . . .” (Office Action, Page 3). Finally, the Office Action states that it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine the teachings of Sangverphunsiri and Hayakawa to arrive at the claimed invention. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

As an initial matter, it is well-established that the teachings of more than one reference may be considered in combination, but only when there is some teaching or suggestion to support their use in the combination. Ashland Oil, Inc. v. Delta Resins & Refractories, Inc., 776 F.2d 281, 293 (Fed. Cir. 1985). None of the cited prior art discloses such a teaching or suggestion. In fact, the Sangveraphunsiri and Hayakawa references teach away from such a combination. Sangveraphunsiri discloses a chip-set module that is to be vertically mounted to the motherboard, or in other words having the module perpendicular to the face of the motherboard. (Sangveraphunsiri, Fig. 20). Similarly, Hayakawa describes a mounting board unit having a holding member for “vertically holding the mounting board.” (Hayakawa, Col. 2, Lines 17-24). Therefore, the person of ordinary skill in the art would not have the appropriate teaching to combine both Sangveraphunsiri and Hayakawa to arrive at a connector allowing a processor to be “horizontal” or “parallel to” the motherboard, as recited in the various claims.

Furthermore, even if Sangveraphunsiri and Hayakawa were combined, they would still not disclose the invention of claims 1-18. For example, element (1-1) of Hayakawa is not a motherboard for a computer but rather is a printer control board. The size of the printer control board is substantially smaller than that of a motherboard, and thus one edge of the printer control board (1-1) and another edge of the controller board (2-1) can be combined together so that both boards are substantially in the same plane. As a result, they are not “parallel” or “horizontal” to one another. In Sangveraphunsiri, the chip-set module is clearly vertical to the motherboard. Therefore, even if the teachings of Sangveraphunsiri and Hayakawa were combined, they would not show the horizontal feature of claims 1-18.

For at least the above reasons, it is believed that claims 1-18 represent patentable subject matter over Sangveraphunsiri in view of Hayakawa, and a fortiori the Feightner and Freer references. Removal of the rejections with respect to claims 1-18 is therefore respectfully requested, and a Notice of Allowance to this effect is earnestly solicited.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at 202-220-4223 to discuss any matter concerning this application.

The Office is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayments under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or § 1.17 to Deposit Account No. 11-0600.

Respectfully submitted on behalf of,

Christopher B. Farmer



by John F. Kacvinsky  
(Patent Registration No. 40,040)

Dated: 8/12/99

KENYON & KENYON  
1500 K Street, N.W., Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
(202) 220-4200  
198253